

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending in the application.

In the present amendment, the specification has been amended to correct informalities.

The specification has also been amended to indicate and correct a printing error made by the Patent Office in the published version of the present application (Publication No. US2002/0030476 A1). Specifically, in the published version, in Paragraph [0046] (corresponding to specification, page 10, line 19), the formula should include the term "[^].5" but instead was printed with the term "0.5."

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 13. Claim 13 has accordingly been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 35. Claim 35 has accordingly been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 40 has been amended to claim a transmitter having a plurality of subcircuits, similar to the transmitter of claim 13 now canceled.

Claims 2-12, 14, 15, 18-23, 25-34, 36-39 and 41 have been amended to correct informalities.

Claims 42-50 are newly added.

No new matter is added by the present amendments.

In the Office Action mailed on September 11, 2003, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Rejected claims 1-9, 23-31 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by *Konopka*.
- B.) Rejected claims 10-12 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Konopka* in view of *Hale et al.*
- C.) Objected to claims 13-23, 35-39 and 41 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner's disposition as follows:

A.) Rejection of claims 1-9, 23-31 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by *Konopka*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in claims 13 and 35. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection based on *Konopka* and do not conceding to the Examiner's rejection, Applicants herein amend independent claims 1, 24 and 40. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 13. Independent claim 24 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 35. Independent claim 40 has been amended to claim a transmitter having a plurality of subcircuits, similar to the subcircuits of claim 13. Therefore, claims 1, 24 and 40, each as amended, are allowable over *Konopka* for at least the same reasons that claims 13 and 35 are allowable over *Konopka*.

Claims 2-9, 23 and 25-31 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 24 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 24 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.) Rejection of claims 10-12 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Konopka* in view of *Hale et al.*:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in claims 13 and 35. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection based on *Konopka* in view of *Hale* and do not concede to the rejection, Applicants herein amend independent claims 1 and 24. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 13. Independent claim 24 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 35. Therefore, claims 1 and 24, each as amended, are allowable over *Konopka* in view of *Hale* for at least the same reasons that claims 13 and 35 are allowable over *Konopka* in view of *Hale*.

Claims 10-12 and 32-34 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 24 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 24 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

C.) Objection to claims 13-23, 35-39 and 41 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim:

Applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's finding of allowable subject matter in claims 13-23, 35-39 and 41.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 13. Independent claim 24 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 35. Independent claim 40 has been amended to claim a transmitter having a plurality of subcircuits, similar to the subcircuits of claim 13. Therefore, claims 1, 24 and 40, each as amended, are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 13 and 35 are allowable.

Claims 14-23, 36-39 and 41 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 24 or 40 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 24 and 40, each as amended, are allowable.

Claims 13 and 35 have been canceled.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-12, 14-34 and 36-50 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Should anything further be required, or if the prosecution of the present patent application may be advanced by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 876-2606.

Respectfully submitted,
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By: Christopher P. Rauch
Christopher P. Rauch (Reg. No. 45,034)

SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)